

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, EX
REL. STEPHEN P. WALLACE,**

Plaintiff,

v.

MITCH MCCONNELL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 19-2168 (JEB)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pro se Plaintiff has filed an opaque Complaint, entitled, “False Claims Class Action Bivens Complaint for Urgent ‘En Banc’ Injunctive Relief, Compelling (3) G.A.O. Forensic Audits.” ECF No. 1. The suit appears to have something to do with a 9/11 Fund, and there is mention of Eric Holder, Mitch McConnell, Robert Mueller, and other luminaries. Id. at 1-2. Plaintiff complains that he has “been totally unsuccessful and now thwarted from confirming where that USA ‘Funded ASSET BIOMETRIC SYSTEM’ is located.” Id. at 2 (bolding deleted). There is also a reference to such “asset” being “divested to Leidos some years ago.” Id. (bolding deleted). Switching gears, Plaintiff also refers to “Criminal Negligent Manslaughter Charges still pending under DC US Attorney, Jessi[e] Liu,” id., as well as “Criminal Kidnapping of LISA, her person & Irrevocable Trust exceeding [\$100 million], by REAL-PARTIES-in-INTEREST.” Id. at 3.

“Over the years this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as

to be absolutely devoid of merit, wholly insubstantial, obviously frivolous, plainly unsubstantial, or no longer open to discussion.” Hagens v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974) (citations omitted); see also Best v. Kelly, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (may dismiss claims that are “essentially fictitious” – for example, where they suggest “bizarre conspiracy theories . . . [or] fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind”) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

The Court is mindful that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). That said, the Court cannot but conclude that the Complaint is frivolous and should be dismissed.

A separate Order so stating will issue this day.

/s/ James E. Boasberg
JAMES E. BOASBERG
United States District Judge

Date: August 1, 2019